

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 16, 2008 in this Application has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 3, 7-11, 14 and 21-24 were previously pending. Claims 21-24 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. New Claim 25 has been added. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated December 15, 2008, Applicant has added the required change markings to Claims 2, 4-6 and 12.

The Examiner has objected to the amended Fig. 1 submitted with the Amendment dated April 26, 2006, on the asserted basis that elements 101 and 103 constitute new matter. The Examiner also states that the Applicant's Response dated February 2, 2007, canceling the amendment to Fig. 1, is insufficient to overcome the objection to the drawings made in the Office Action mailed November 2, 2006.

In response, Applicant herewith submits a corrected replacement Fig. 1, without the objected-to amendments. This replacement sheet is the same as Fig. 1 as originally filed. The Examiner's approval is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has commented that the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 13, 2008, includes an extraordinarily large number of references and has requested that Applicant eliminate clearly irrelevant and marginally pertinent cumulative information and/or highlight those documents which have been specifically brought to Applicant's attention and/or are known to be of most significance.

Applicant apologizes for its long list of disclosed references. It was not Applicant's invention to "bury" any relevant references. The long list resulted from numerous references cited in other prosecutions by the Applicant of other applications for various reduced-keyboard-related

inventions. In order to assist the Examiner, Applicant points out that References Nos. E21, E25, E30, E31, E33, E34 and E39 relate to input of ideographic characters using a reduced-size keyboard and, on that basis, the Examiner may consider them to be more relevant than the other references cited by Applicant in the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 13, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner give consideration to these references, and to all other references cited by the Applicant, to the extent such are deemed relevant by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 14, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as assertedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement and/or 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as assertedly using indefinite language. Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action and has amended Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 14, 16 and 17 to make the language of the Claims clear so that the Claims clearly recite enabled subject matter using definite language. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 14, 16 and 17 under Section 112, first and second paragraph, have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, be withdrawn.

The Examiner acknowledges that the trigger sequence illustrated in Fig. 13 is not taught by the prior art of record, including Ouyang. (U.S. Patent No. 6,765,504). It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 14, 16 and 17 now clearly read on Fig. 13 and, thus, should be allowable. Since it is submitted that the rejections of Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 14, 16 and 17 under Section 112, first and second paragraph, have been overcome, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 14, 16 and 17 are in condition for allowance and such is courteously solicited.

New Claim 25 has been added. Claim 25 closely tracks the language in the Specification at Par. 81, and so clearly meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. The language of new Claim 23 is also similar to original Claim 1 of this application, so the Examiner has

already performed a search of the prior art encompassing this invention. Claim 25 also clearly reads on Fig. 13. Claim 25 is different from original Claim 1 in that Claim 25 also includes the limitation that the “where said second keystroke [constituting a symbol-input-end symbol] is on a key having a pre-conversion symbol assigned to it, [it] also immediately caus[es] display of a pre-conversion symbol assigned to said key for later possible input and inclusion in a subsequent sequence of pre-conversion symbols.” This limitation is neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record, including Ouyang. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 25 is allowable.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 14, 16 and 17 and 25.

Applicant authorizes the Director to charge the required fee for the one additional independent claim to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP. Applicant hereby requests an extension of time of two (2) months for making this reply and hereby authorizes the Director to charge the required fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP. Applicant does not believe that any additional fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: December 17, 2008
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3032
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Theodore F. Shiells/
Theodore F. Shiells
Reg. No. 31,569